Introduction

著者	BAXTER　James C.
会議概要（会議名，開催地，会期，主催者等）	Historical Consciousness, Historiography, and Modern Japanese Values, 2002年10月末-11月, カナダ, アルバータ州バンフ
page range	v-xvi
year	2006-11-30
シリーズ	北米シンポジウム International Symposium in North America 2001
URL	http://doi.org/10.15055/00001476

Introduction

James C. Baxter
International Research Center for Japanese Studies

The essays in this collection explore ways in which twentieth-century Japanese understood and presented their history—or, more accurately, histories. Ranging over a broad intellectual terrain and representing several disciplinary approaches, earlier versions of these essays were presented and discussed at an international symposium in Banff, Alberta, Canada, late in 2002. The theme of that conference, "Historical Consciousness, Historiography, and Modern Japanese Values," was deliberately stated in expansive terms by the organizers from the International Research Center for Japanese Studies (Nichibunken) and the University of Calgary. It was our intent to create a discursive space in which scholars in many academic fields, not only professional historians, could draw on resources in which they already had developed interest, then place their findings into the context of our common inquiry. An important premise in our thinking as we planned this event was that the work in every scholarly discipline—or performing art or other medium—can be evaluated in historical perspective; considered in the dimension of time, all work constitutes historical material, and once this has been recognized, it is susceptible to analysis in historiographical terms. We asked participants in our symposium to craft presentations so as to make analysis of twentieth-century scholarship (or popular writing or expression in other media that draw on history for material) a major focus. Our aim was to foster interdisciplinary reflection about how changes over time in scholarship or other work done in the Taishō, Shōwa, and early Heisei periods influenced or failed to influence identity-consciousness or formation of values of the Japanese people, individually and collectively.

Historiography as we took it for purposes of this project refers not only to the writing of history—although it certainly does denote that—but also to work in other media that incorporates history (or more precisely, versions or constructions of history). We wished to reconsider or in some instances to think anew about how historiography influences peoples' senses of values. One of the defining characteristics of Nichibunken is that we attempt systematically to approach problems from interdisciplinary, comparative perspectives, and only a few members of our faculty are historians by training and self-identification, but it was fundamental to the conception of this project that we perceived that interest in history in Japan is high, and understanding of history figures in the identity-formation of a great many people, by no means only professional historians. Non-historians on our own faculty could, we felt sure, contribute to and profit from participating in an examination of historiography and its influence, and we hoped that by getting together with scholars from overseas and from a few other institutions in Japan, we could discover things that would advance the state of learning and be of wide benefit. It may be unnecessary to state explicitly that history does not mean exclusively national history. In this project, we did not confine our notion of history to national stories or any other single type of account. Consistent with Nichibunken's usual practice, we invited scholars from diverse academic specializations to take part, believing that

if they turned their attention to the production and consumption of history in their own disciplines and how this affects values-formation, they might cast new light on the central problem of this project. This volume evidences our embrace of multiple types of history and our recognition that non-historians can engage productively in historical considerations.

The first essay in this book is an enlarged English reworking of a presentation originally delivered in Japanese, and it directs our attention to different aspects of the interaction between history-writing and values-consciousness. Yamaori Tetsuo surveys several instances of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean treatments of dead persons whose actions were reviled by many people of later generations. Not only in the twentieth century, but over many centuries, he maintains, both in history writing and in living people's attitudes toward these deceased historical personages, these three East Asian societies have differed from each other, with Japan typically being the most forgiving, or tolerant, of the dead. The penetration of Buddhist ideals more widely and deeply into Japanese thought and behavior than into Chinese or Korean thought and behavior, Yamaori proposes, probably accounts for the differences. Aware that the high level of generalization of his argument might provoke disagreement (and indeed it did, in Banff), he proceeds boldly ahead, desiring to get readers thinking and talking about a fundamental human question—how do we regard the dead?—that underlies one of the most difficult East Asian regional controversies of our own day.

Several of our authors concentrate on Japanese history and writing by professional historians in the twentieth century. Inaga Shigemi examines several Ministry of Education-approved textbooks for junior high schools and high schools, including the highly controversial book by the Atarashii Rekishi Kyōkasho o Tsukuru Kai (Society for Writing a New History Textbook) published by Fusōsha. He observes that illustrations in these books convey nonverbal messages that quite often escape teachers' and critics' analysis, and he draws attention to several illustrations common in textbooks even today (not only the Fusōsha book) that perpetuate prewar images (and unarticulated attitudes) about "exotic," "Oriental," and/or inferior "Other" non-Japanese. Plainly different sets of values are competing in the history textbook market in Japan today, and the important thing for teachers and students is to be alert to instances when textbooks are biased. Those who make textbook selections and especially teachers should be critical, Inaga advises. If teachers are scrupulously careful to discriminate between opinion and evidence, they can make even distorted texts and illustrations into materials for excellent teaching and learning about history.

John Brownlee surveys major works of leading academics who specialized in political history from the Meiji Restoration through World War II. He argues that nationalism conditioned all their writings. Some prominent professors and scholars were conscious of deliberately oversimplifying history when they presented the Japanese past to the broad public (in elementary and secondary school textbooks, for example), but in some instances their nationalism caused them even to deceive themselves about historical truth. Brownlee maintains that in the prewar period, with the exception of a few marginalized (not very influential) leftists, historians in Japanese universities obeyed state directives to publish orthodox nationalistic interpretations of Japan's past. Even in the postwar period, political history as practiced by leading scholars at important Japanese universities tends to be detached, disengaged, and dispassionate, and many fine scholars steer clear of controversy.

In his contribution to this volume, Inoki Takenori demonstrates that in postwar Japanese economic history, a number of widely-accepted interpretations do not stand up to the test of quantitative analysis that processes a large amount of data collected not only from Japan but also from other nations. Those widely influential interpretations were products of ideology-based methodologies. More recent research is based on "evidence before argument" methods. One important finding of this new research, Inoki shows, is that the Japanese economy is not "unique"—and not so idiosyncratic as previously believed. Historiography based on "defining and then observing, rather than observing and then defining" had led to distorted views of Japan's economic past and also its present.

The story of the Akō revenge incident of 1703, generally known as the Chūshingura story, illustrates how the raw material of history is processed and reprocessed in different times and different media. This incident has been represented in *ukiyozōshi* (a genre of popular fiction that appeared in the mid-Edo period—"tales of the floating world") called *jitsuroku* (true records), in illustrated works of literature (*ehon yomihon*), in stage adaptations, in *kōdan* story-telling, in long novels, in *naniwabushi* (story-telling with shamisen accompaniment), in movies, and in radio and television dramas. The facts of the case are rather difficult to establish, and in different versions, more and more fictions have been invented to elaborate what little is known for certain. Here Henry Smith follows the historical evolution of the media of communication and shows how changes have interacted with politics to enable certain types of stories to achieve special preeminence. He proposes a notion that he labels the "media complex," structured by the technologies available at any given time and by the political conditions that prevail at that time. After outlining four historical media complexes in Japan—medieval, Tokugawa, Meiji, and modern—he traces the Chūshingura story through the last three of these and analyzes its transformations. Throughout his essay, he weaves reflections on writing of history and presentation of history in the performing arts. "'Historiography' by its very etymology privileges written texts," he remarks, "but a true historiography of popular history forces us to broaden our range to embrace the performing arts and particularly their modern perpetuation in film and television."

Satō Takumi also takes the media as his subject. In these pages, he analyzes how Japanese newspapers and radio helped to shape postwar historical consciousness. The "politics of memory" and the desires of different individuals and groups to use commemorative observances for their own purposes enter into the shaping of historical narratives, he reminds us. This extends to identification of particular events as belonging to specific dates. Selecting the establishment of a date for commemoration of the end of the Second World War in Japan as a case study, Satō examines presentations of contemporary history by the media, and notes that for people born in the postwar era, these (with accounts presented on television supplementing the those in newspapers and on the radio) create historical consciousness. The media contribute enormously to create "collective memory."

Satoshi Ikeda, a student of world systems whose basic methodology is drawn from historical sociology, presents a long view of four-and-a-half centuries of Japanese history and argues that the project of modernization in Japan has failed. With the collapse of the economic bubble, he maintains, the institutions that drove Japan's postwar economic growth ceased to work. Yet it is not only in Japan that modernization has failed—as Ikeda sees it, the ideals of modernization were achieved only in a very small number of developed countries. He offers

several prescriptions for overcoming this failure, including more thoroughgoing internationalism, domestic economic communalism and reciprocity, and expanded local self-sufficiency. This interesting critique did not directly engage the topic of history writing in twentieth-century Japan, and some of the professional historians in our symposium objected that Ikeda used historical information in an overly general and abstract manner. The discussion exposed a methodological divide and ended without resolution. At the same time, it made clear that interdisciplinary dialogue is instructive for researchers on both sides of that divide. Being challenged to refine perspectives and justify one's handling of evidence can be salutary, and at our meeting in Banff, it was.

Sociologist Sonoda Hidehiro takes a more familiar approach to historical study in "Yokohama e no mō hitotsu no michi: Taiheiyō kōro o meguru Amerika to Igirisu no kyōgō" 横浜へのもう一つの道：太平洋航路をめぐるアメリカとイギリスの競合 (Anglo-American Rivalry over Steamship Lanes to Yokohama and Shanghai: Shifts in Historical Consciousness in the Emergence of the Global Age, here printed in Japanese). As his subtitle suggests, Sonoda sees the revolution in transportation of the nineteenth century in terms of an early developmental form of globalism. He reflects on the cultural relations among the Western powers and Japan within the framework established by the completion, around 1870, of round-the-world linkages of railways and steamship routes that were open to and relatively affordable by passengers. As more and more people experienced global travel, and as the spread of telegraph technology facilitated almost instantaneous communication between distant places, perspectives on the world, and on history, began to change. Sonoda shows us how Japan benefited from the competition between British and American business interests, as increased trade and cultural contact with the West were byproducts of that rivalry.

A different angle on cultural relations is offered by Richard John Lynn, who probes contacts between Chinese and Japanese. Focusing on the scholar and Waseda University professor Sanetō Keishū, Lynn tells us of Sanetō's studies of Chinese exchange students in Japan from the Meiji era forward, and also of his development of close relations with Chinese intellectuals and Chinese students of his own day. While building a precious collection of primary sources on exchange students, Sanetō made a major contribution to Sino-Japanese intellectual history with his biographies and brief biographical notes on those students. He also became the leading authority on Chinese translations of Japanese books and Sino-Japanese bibliography generally. Insisting on fidelity to original sources, and starting with the presumption that the China and Japan were equally worthy, Sanetō took a long, balanced view of cultural relations between two great nations that were frequently at odds with each other during his own lifetime, Lynn shows us.

Historical fiction must be recognized as important, and deserves serious consideration, in any effort to assess historical consciousness and values-formation. Turning to the nature and impact of historical fiction, Vinh Sinh examines the principal animating ideas in the writings of a bestselling novelist whose influence on popular views of Japanese history may exceed that of all the academic historians of the twentieth century. To meet the challenge of a global world, Shiba Ryōtarō argued that Japan needed to reinvigorate samurai values, some of the most important of which Vinh identifies as *shōjiki* 正直 (honesty or straightforwardness); *jijo* 自助 (self-help) and *dokuritsu* 独立 (independence—standing on one's own feet); and *gimu*

義務 (duty). Vinh refrains from offering a critique Shiba's skill as a handler of sources and materials, but focuses on his influence on political leaders and the general reading public.

Joshua Fogel takes a harder, more critical look at Shiba Ryōtarō than Vinh Sinh. Acknowledging that Shiba was an expert researcher, Fogel still finds fault with the novelist's use of sources and attention to accuracy. He questions whether Shiba's works are history, or historical popularizations. He points out that Shiba "was often prone to precisely the kind of generalization which we as historians and literary scholars tend to avoid at all cost." In short, Fogel argues that Shiba's massive output is problematic and must be handled with care. It can be understood as valuable, but not exactly as history. While it goes almost without saying that the genre of historical fiction (in Japan and elsewhere) is different from history itself, on the one hand, and from history as done by academics, on the other, because of Shiba's enormous popularity and the widespread influence of his views, it is important to remember these distinctions when we read him.

Suzuki Sadami makes us aware of the importance of taxonomical precision, if we wish to appreciate the significance of fictional works that use history in one way or another. It seems indispensable to have a conceptual framework of literary genres, not only in Japan and China but also in the modern West, and a grasp of the chronology of their emergence. In an attempt to understand the place and meaning of the *jidai shōsetsu* 時代小説 (literally, period novel) and/or *rekishi shōsetsu* 歴史小説 (literally, historical novel), that is, to begin to appreciate the impact such literary works have on people's historical consciousness, it is essential to identify works that won wide acceptance among the general public (*minshū* 民衆 or *taishū* 大衆) in modern Japan, and to examine the techniques of composition and values in such works. In his Banff essay, Suzuki takes Nakazato Kaizan and Yoshikawa Eiji as representative authors of historical novels that shaped the thinking about Japanese history of a wide audience—not just literary youth, but readers of mass media magazines and inexpensive editions of novels.

These essays on historical fiction make clear that in the hands of some writers, the story is closely faithful to historical documents and to other kinds of evidence. The values that animate the authors of historical fiction, and that are conveyed to their readers, have many sources—from Buddhism, from Confucianism, from *bushidō*, from Marxism, and from many other sources—and it is impossible to reduce these values to a simple list or a descriptive statement that would apply to all modern Japanese historical fiction. Most of the novelists discussed in this volume studied the works of professional historians closely. Several had close relationships with professional historians. There is, however, no single national narrative or national historical consciousness that we can discover in their works. Many were quite critical of the political authorities—at least by implication—and of the view of national history that was promoted by the prewar Japanese state. Studying historical fiction for clues about the relationship between historiography and Japanese consciousness of values and norms, we must reconcile ourselves to the idea that the relationship is multilayered and diverse.

Concentrating on visual materials, primarily *ekotoba* and *emaki*, X. Jie Yang delves into the depiction of history in those, and recent scholarship on these materials. Examining an *emaki* of the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century called the *Mōko shūrai ekotoba*, he points out that although the pictures do not necessarily reproduce real life scenes, they do

stand as an expression of the views and values of the era of their production. Sometimes they are the only record, the only surviving evidence, of an event or events. Recent scholarship has defined picture scrolls as historical documents that merit close analysis similar to that formerly given only to written texts. Yang compares a number of pictures with similar themes in order to recognize patterns and elucidate the principles behind those patterns.

Joshua Mostow, writing about reception history (*kyōjushi* 享受史) within the field of Japanese literary history (*kokubungaku* 国文学), points out that in recent years more and more scholars have put emphasis on recovering earlier "readings" of texts and have not simply attempted to establish "correct" readings. Discovery of these old readings legitimizes plural interpretations today; it makes possible "escape" from "authoritative/authoritarian" readings. The possibility of multiple readings applies also to the interpretation of illustrations of Japanese texts. Speaking at The Banff Centre, Mostow used scenes from the *Tales of Ise* to demonstrate plural readings in pictorializations produced in different historical eras from the thirteenth century to the present day, but in the pages of this volume, he relies on written descriptions.

Two essays on the history of science and one on archaeology provide stimulating insights into how the modern life sciences and archeology in Japan are linked with deep cultural values regarding nature. Scholars such as James Bartholomew have noted that history of science (as a scholarly discipline with practitioners in many nations) has failed to give credit to important original contributions made by Japanese thinkers and researchers in natural and life sciences. In her contribution to this volume, Pamela Asquith presents evidence of the accomplishments of Imanishi Kinji (1902-1992), and argues persuasively that his theories in the life sciences have not been fully understood in the context of world science. Asquith makes a case for Imanishi's significance as an original researcher. Remarking that an enormous wealth of information has recently become available with the opening of the archives of the Imanishi Papers, she is convinced that scholars who mine this material will transform the history of his contribution to the theories of evolution. After beginning as a student of ecology and entomology, Imanishi spent most of his academic career as a professor of both social and cultural anthropology and also of primatology. He advanced "anti-Darwinian" views that Asquith says should actually be termed anti-selectionist. Critics such as Peter Dale have characterized those views as belonging to a nationalist genre of nihonjinron writing. Asquith disagrees sharply with writers who have seen Imanishi's work as the basis for several nihonjinron-linked theories of the nature of society. "Such attributions are," she states, "simply wrong in face of the evidence from the Imanishi papers. Imanishi's views were instead based on careful observation of the natural world and extraordinary digging into Western scientific and social historical writings on his subjects of interest."

In "Yōgaku no Nihon-ka" (The Japanization of Western Learning), Kawakatsu Heita pairs Imanishi Kinji with Minakata Kumagusu (1867-1941). Trained in Western science and deeply knowledgeable about it, these men devised holistic approaches to research that took the whole earth into the field of vision, and created distinctively "Eastern" styles of scholarship. Yet they clearly drew lines between their own thinking and the nationalism and "national purity" ideology (*kokusui shugi*) that were prevalent during much of their lifetimes. Imanishi set down his view of history in the fifth and final section of *Seibutsu no sekai* (The

World of Living Things, originally published in 1941). Ordinarily "history" is taken to refer to human history, but Imanishi used the term—deliberately—in a non-anthropocentric sense. Minakata, an autodidact who spent his late twenties and early thirties in London, won international recognition as the contributor of fifty articles that appeared in the journal Nature and went on to become a famous mycologist and a pioneer spokesman of the ecology movement. He and Imanishi influenced the way Japanese people have perceived history, in Kawakatsu's judgment, because they offered a philosophical basis for alternatives to the notions of history derived from the study of Western academic models, especially Marxism and modernization (stage development) theory. In a condensed but suggestive passage on mutual influences, Kawakatsu offers a schematic that compares Imanishi to selected other Japanese and Western thinkers by characterizing their primary orientations:

	Space-oriented		**Time-oriented**	
Philosophy	Nishida Kitarō	"Place" (*ba* 場)	Hegel	Philosophy of history
Views of nature	Imanishi Kinji	"Speciation" or "Habitat segregation" (*sumiwake* 棲み分け)	Darwin	Natural selection
Views of history	Umesao Tadao and others	Ecological view of history	Marx	Historical materialism

Minakata had fallen into neglect, Kawakatsu notes, until Tsurumi Kazuko (1918-2006) took him up in an important 1995 essay. In her "Minakata-Mandala: A Paradigm Change for the Future," written in English, Tsurumi observed that Minakata's treatment of chance (or the accidental—*gūzensei* 偶然性) anticipated chaos theory and theories of fuzzy logic by nearly a century. Minakata perceived the limitations of a logic of causation that ascribed one-to-one correspondences between cause and effect, and he saw the implications of this perception for social sciences as well as natural sciences. With specific reference to historical study, Kawakatsu remarks, no single model, Western or Japanese, can be accepted as satisfactory in light of Minakata's insight. Imanishi and Minakata did not reject Western science when they created their original theories. Rather, they Japanized it, pointing the way beyond borrowing ideas and methods. Kawakatsu sees them as inspirational figures for us as we think about how to understand history. They challenge us: to have standards of verification such as they had in their empirical fieldwork; to take a multidisciplinary approach; to escape from both Western-centric and "national purity" ideology-driven modes of analysis; and to conceptualize history in terms of regions or other units of study that break out of the confines of national or other parochial narratives.

Clare Fawcett's essay examines the competition in modern Japan between the science of archeology and the tourism industry—a competition over narratives of pre-historical Japan. Tourism strives to tell a simple story of the "Japanese" inhabiting the archipelago from long ago, while archeological research keeps complicating the picture with unanswered questions. At the heart of many of these narratives is the nature of the connection between the Japanese people and the "land" or natural environment. "Archaeological sites and

information create and sustain national identities, and, in some cases, uphold nationalist agendas," Fawcett comments. In Japan such sites have become popular tourist destinations, and some local boosters and nihonjinron proponents have marketed some prehistoric sites, for example those around Asuka-mura in Nara prefecture, as spiritual "hometowns" (*kokoro no furusato*). The early- and middle-Jōmon site at Sannai Maruyama in Aomori prefecture captured national attention in the 1990s, and by 1997, over a million people came to see its excavations and artifacts. Community supporters of the Sannai Maruyama site publish a monthly bulletin that popularizes the findings of researchers about the social organization of the Jōmon settlements, about subsistence (diet and means of acquiring food), and other topics. Among those other topics are the connection between contemporary Japanese and the Jōmon people who lived in Sannai Maruyama, which has implications for ethnic identity, and Jōmon spiritual beliefs. The discussions regarding beliefs, Fawcett says, use imaginative speculation and ethnographic analogy from contemporary Japan. Especially relevant to the theme of this volume and the whole historiography and values project is Fawcett's finding that archaeological tourism influences Japanese historical consciousness, as people who visit such sites as Asuka-mura and Sannai Maruyama are "explicitly and implicitly encouraged to think about what it means to be Japanese."

Julia Adeney Thomas delineates an intersection of intellectual history (particularly the modern concept of history, and the unstated assumptions underlying it, in Europe) and philosophical thinking about nature (particularly in Japan). Beginning with a rather sweeping generalization by Thomas Mann that proposes, as she summarizes it, a "neat dichotomy [that] pits History, Ego, Consciousness, and the West against Nature, Id, the Unconscious, and the East," she characterizes the typical modern view of nature—as represented for example in the thinking of G. W. F. Hegel, Karl Marx, Walter Bagehot, John Stuart Mill, George Lukács, and Roland Barthes—as something that poses "a problematic limit on freedom." History, she says, tries to master nature, but cannot, and ends up instead "merely suppressing it." "How," Thomas inquires, "was Japan to respond to modern history, structured as it was by the repression of nature—and all that nature implied: unfreedom, baleful custom, inarticulate childhood, amoral impulse, and, most particularly, The East?" She comments on Fukuzawa Yukichi, Katō Hiroyuki, and Maruyama Masao—all basically in harmony with the thinking of the Westerners whom she names—but devotes more attention to what she calls a "strategy for thinking about the relation between modernity and nature which . . . relied, not on misrecognizing modernity as something that could be overcome or attained naturally through evolution, but on a profound understanding of the flawed structure of modern history, flawed because it had jettisoned the problem of nature to the realm of the unthought." This strategy was represented by Watsuji Tetsurō and the authors (two committees of scholars, on one of which Watsuji served) of the *Kokutai no hongi* (Fundamentals of Our National Polity), published by the Ministry of Education in 1937. Out of desire to integrate humanity and nature, Thomas tells us, Watsuji and the *Kokutai no hongi* writers propounded a "holism" that extended beyond history and the humanities to the sciences. Their formulation was not successful, however. "Nature had been recovered for history only on national grounds, and humanity had been reincorporated within the natural sciences only intellectually," Thomas observes in her conclusion.

Gender history has been, in recent years, one of the most active and exciting fields of research in North American studies of Japan. Kathleen Uno and Andrea Germer represent the field of women's history in this volume. Concentrating mostly on studies published in the U.S. since 1970, Uno surveys writing about the history of women's place and activities. She traces a trajectory of development from the kind of social history that treated women as a social group susceptible to quantitative description and analysis (and deemphasized individuals; this approach did yield many valuable insights into family patterns, fertility, male and female mortality, and other important aspects of human life) to the new gender history (a subfield of social history that examines mutually related constructions of female and male lives). Uno's purpose, however, is not simply to describe what has been done and thus to show the current state of the field. It is to set a new agenda. Remarking that the field of children's history has advanced more slowly than women's history and gender history, she lays out the beginnings of a remedial program. She proposes interconnecting children's history, women's history, and social history, in the process reexamining the definition of childhood itself and how it has varied in different societies in different times, and grounding the study of children's history in the contexts of the histories of the Japanese household (*ie*) and other social institutions.

In the realm of feminist historiography, Andrea Germer presents a critical analysis of the many-layered historical consciousness of Takamure Itsue (1894-1964), "the first woman historian" of Japan, who turned her enormous talent and energy from literature to history-writing in 1931. Takamure challenged the then-widely-held notion that the patriarchal *ie*-concept represented an unchanging, "genuinely Japanese" family. It was her belief that writing women's history would force a paradigm shift in Japanese historiography. Living in turbulent times, she shifted from anarchist to cultural nationalist to pacifist, and what seem to be the inconsistencies in her life and thought have often puzzled scholars. Through all Takamure's historical work, however, Germer sees three unchanging themes: "Woman," "Japan," and "(romantic/motherly) 'Love.'" Takamure criticized the male bias in traditional history-writing, which blinded authors to gender and family history, and she made the metaphor of the slave central to her feminist historical theory. This metaphor encompassed "the gender-defined group of women as a social group" and it also took in the peasantry in early modern Japan. But Takamure was interested in a definition of women's social position, rather than in a theory of institutionalized slavery. When she supported Japan in the fifteen-year war, she seems to have had a blind spot of her own: Germer notes that "in her conceptual use of the slave she did not consider questions of ethnicity and power *among* women." Takamure's aim in supporting the war effort was to pave the road for full citizenship for women, but her actions "had grave consequences for a concept of Asian women's unity" and amounted to collaborating "with a national project that exerted power over and inflicted immense suffering on other Asian women."

Theater and cinema, and how they interact with history, are the focus of the final three essays in this book, which were written by scholars of Japanese literature Cody Poulton, Thomas LaMarre, and Sharalyn Orbaugh. Poulton discusses a contemporary playwright, Hirata Oriza, concentrating on his prize-winning 1995 play *Tōkyō nōto* (Tokyo Notes) and illustrating that he is interested in social issues, "particularly the Japanese people's confrontation (or lack

thereof) with world historical events." Hirata uses a gallery with an exhibition of Vermeer paintings as a setting to provide a kind of counterpoint between the quotidian personal and family concerns of the characters (which deliberately echo those in Ozu Yasujirō's classic film *Tokyo Story*) and the dramatic things going on in the outside world ("world historical events," such as the war in Bosnia, which was going on at the time of composition). Even before introducing Hirata by name, Poulton first, to convey a sense of where we should "place" this writer-director and his kind of theater, gives us a précis of the modern history of the theater in the West and in Asia. Asian conventions such as "the spectacle, formal rigor, and musicality of Japanese noh and kabuki, Chinese *jingju*, and Balinese *barong*" inspired several generations of Western stage directors from the early twentieth century onward, while in Asia as represented by Japan the "new theater" (*shingeki*) that developed beginning in the 1880s sought to break with the traditions of noh, *ningyō jōruri*, and kabuki, and to replace them with something like "Western" realism. Thus, curiously, the trends ran opposite each other. Poulton observes that Hirata describes his own work as "meant to portray not events or actions, but rather human existence and relationships." Historiography is nowhere explicitly treated by either Poulton or Hirata, but the latter's plays are marked by an awareness of history and of a web of human relationships within the dimension of "time as it is lived—quietly" (Hirata's phrase, quoted by Poulton).

Until Tom LaMarre brought it to our attention, a fascinating chapter in the career of the great writer Tanizaki Jun'ichirō had been virtually unknown outside Japan and pretty much forgotten (except by a few connoisseurs and historians) in Japan, namely the story of the early 1920s, when Tanizaki threw himself into screenwriting and other aspects of film production. LaMarre informs us that the author quickly mastered the "continuity style" that had been pioneered in Hollywood, and learned to manipulate the cinematic techniques of fades, cuts, and irises to establish time and distinguish between different sequences of time. Tanizaki's film work should be seen "in terms of variations on or transformations of a global modernity," LaMarre contends, and national boundaries or national cultures are not really salient as primary sites of difference. Tanizaki's use of continuity style exemplifies "a very modern problem, . . . the spatialization of time." This spatialization of time, LaMarre suggests, implies an "ambivalence about Japan's past." Tanizaki was interested in testing the applicability of continuity style to historical subject material, as demonstrated in the 1921 movie *Jasei no in* (The Lust of the White Serpent, on which he collaborated with Kurihara Kitarō). The author's interest was not in "meticulously accurate recreation of historical details," however, but rather in evoking a feeling of the past— "above and beyond historical recreation or historical evocation," in LaMarre's estimation, "Tanizaki strove for a terrifying experience of time out of joint, rather than a controlled historical relation to the past."

Sharalyn Orbaugh anatomizes director Ichikawa Kon's great film on the 1964 Olympic Games, *Tokyo Olympiad*, and compares it closely with Leni Riefenstahl's powerful documentary on the 1936 Berlin Olympics as she explores the model of communication in the public sphere proposed by Jürgen Habermas and the applicability of that model to 1960s Japan. Orbaugh is concerned here in her "Raced Bodies and the Public Sphere" with tackling issues of contemporary spectacles and their reception—that is, with spectacles such as the Olympic Games (and the messages embedded within them) and the way those are experienced or

consumed by audiences and then, on another level, when they have been incorporated along with the athletes as subjects of films, the way the original audience becomes part of the spectacle viewed by a larger audience. Although her engagement of issues of history and historiography is almost incidental, Orbaugh's insights here are extremely suggestive about the manipulability, or flexibile quality, of images *qua* historical materials. Toward the end of her essay, in a section subtitled "Ethnography vs. Historiography," she takes note of Claude Lévi-Strauss's distinction between "historifiable" and "ethnographiable" peoples; she mentions this without exactly endorsing it, instead segueing to characterize Ichikawa's documentary as an ethnographic film "fixed within a historical frame." Her observations about how Ichikawa treats bodies as racially and nationally marked are also instructive to students of history and historiography—not only of Japanese history and historiography, but of history and historiography in general.

Eight people who gave papers at the Banff Symposium did not, for one reason or another, submit revised manuscripts for inclusion in these pages. Political scientist Michael Donnelly of the University of Toronto discussed "'Politics, Economics and Corruption' in Postwar Japan." Political scientist Wenren Jiang of the University of Alberta spoke on "Image, Imaging and Imagination in the History of Sino-Japanese Relations." Timothy D. Kern of Nichibunken offered "Missionaries' Treatments of Japanese History in the Early Twentieth Century." Historian of science Gordon McOuat of University of King's College and Dalhousie University) talked about "Trees of Life/Webs of Life: Importing and Resisting Historical Consciousness in Imperial Japanese Life Sciences." Japanese literature scholar Nakagawa Shigemi of Ritsumeikan University (who at the time of the conference was teaching at Stanford University) gave us thoughts about "How Literature Recalls and Narrates the Memory of War: Kazuo Ishiguro and History Description." Historian Tokuda Kazuo of Gakushuin Women's College addressed the uses of visual images in history in "Picture Interpretation: *Etoki* and *Engi Emaki* in Premodern Japan." Historian and women's studies specialist Ulrike Wöhr delivered "History, Ethnicity and Gender: Japanese Feminism 'Returning to Asia'?" In "Continuities and Discontinuities: The Politics of Love/Marriage in Prewar and Postwar Japan," historian of women Barbara Sato took the arranged and "love" varieties of marriage as tools for comprehending the values of middle-class women from Meiji through Showa. We very much regret the absence here of examples of all this interesting research.

Discussants are critical to the success of any academic meeting that aspires to productive intellectual exchange. We were fortunate to have perceptive scholars in that role. Sonja Arntzen of the University of Toronto, Martin Collcutt of Princeton University, Irmela Hijiya-Kirschnereit of the Deutsche Institut für Japanstudien, Tokyo, and the Free University of Berlin, Ishii Shirō, emeritus professor of the University of Tokyo Faculty of Law and also of Nichibunken, Komatsu Kazuhiko of Nichibunken, Barbara Molony of Santa Clara University, and Patricia Tsurumi, professor emerita of the University of Victoria, helped make this conference constantly stimulating and gave many valuable comments to the authors of papers. I, too, served as a discussant.

As has become our custom in Nichibunken-organized (or co-organized) meetings outside Japan, we declared in advance of the Banff Symposium that we would recognize both Japanese and English as "official" languages. This book reflects the choices of the authors of papers, except for Professor Yamaori's essay, which has been translated into English. Discussion went back and forth in both languages. It has been our experience that this works pretty well in groups in which everyone present has a considerable degree of mastery but not necessarily the same level of capability to produce orally in the language that is not his or her native tongue. Communication is never perfect, we have to concede, not even among native speakers of the same language. The bilingual format is a sort of compromise, but it is one that we have found practical.

Finally, it may be useful to offer a few words on the style of names, terms, notes, and bibliographic references in this book. Japanese names appear in their Japanese order except when a person has reversed that order for purposes of non-Japanese-language publication or daily life (getting a driver's license, for example) overseas. For the forms of capitalization, italicization, transliteration of terms, and the like, and for the forms of notes and bibliographic references, we requested that authors follow the guidelines of the *Monumenta Nipponica* Style Sheet, which Nichbunken has adopted, with permission, for our journal *Japan Review* and other Western-language publications. I confess that we were not thoroughly rigorous in enforcing those guidelines, when we actually had revised manuscripts in hand and were preparing this volume for printing. The style of this book can be regarded as a hybrid of the conventions of *Monumenta Nipponica* style and the conventions that individual authors have learned in their various disciplines.